

**PATENT** 

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| In re Patent Application of:  Hagopian et al. | ) Examiner: Howard E. Abramowitz   |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Hagopian et al.                               | ) Art Unit: 1762                   |
| Serial No.: 10/710,805                        | )                                  |
| Filed: August 4, 2004                         | ) CUSTOMER NO. 24024               |
| Ç ,   | ) Confirmation No.: 4804           |
| For: PRODUCT COMPRISING A THIN-FILMED         | )                                  |
| RADIATION-CURED COATING ON A THREE-           | ) Attorney Docket No.: 27475/06963 |
| DIMENSIONAL SUBSTRATE                         | )                                  |

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## **RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

## INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

This document responds to the Office Action mailed on July 5, 2005 (the "Office Action"). Claims 1-56 are now pending in this application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18, 19, 27, 28 and 29 as being purportedly indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1-5, 7, 12-17, 46, 47 and 51-56 on the grounds that they are purportedly anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 6,231,931 ("Blazey '931"). The Examiner further rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 53 and 56 as being purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,268,022 ("Schlegel '022"). The Examiner further rejected claims 1-5, 7-13, 18, 20-22, 28, 32-35, 39-44, 46, 47, 49 and 51-56 as being purportedly

anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,989,638 ("Nielsen '638"). The Examiner further rejected claims 1, 4-7, 12, 13, 32-35, 52, 53 and 56 as being purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0183166 (U.S. Patent No. 6,746,535 ("Hasenour '535")). The Examiner further rejected several dependent claims as described in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blazey '931 or Nielsen '638 taken in view of other prior art references. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejections for the reasons more fully set forth below.